



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

*THE CENTENNIAL OF KANT'S KRITIK AT SARATOGA, N. Y.*

HAMILTON COLLEGE, July 30, 1881.

WM. T. HARRIS, LL.D., *Editor of the Journal of Speculative Philosophy.*

DEAR SIR: In response to your request, I herewith enclose a brief account of the celebration of the Centennial of Kant's *Kritik*, observed at Saratoga, N. Y., July 6th and 7th, as prepared chiefly by the Secretary, Mr. Taylor.

JOHN W. MEARS.

## PROCEEDINGS AT THE CENTENNIAL OF "KANT'S KRITIK."

Temple Grove parlor, Saratoga, witnessed, on the 6th of July, a select gathering intended to honor the memory of the great German philosopher, Kant, in this the hundredth anniversary of the publication of his greatest work, "The *Kritik* of the Pure Reason." There were present President Seelye, of Amherst College, who was chosen chairman; President Bascom, of Wisconsin University; Professors Morris, of Johns Hopkins University; Mears, of Hamilton College; Bennett, of Syracuse University; Bliss, of Vermont University; and A. S. Lyman, of Yale College; also Dr. Herrick Johnson and lady, of Chicago; Mr. Libbey, of the "Princeton Review"; Mr. Thomas H. Pease and lady, of New Haven; Rev. C. E. Lindsey and lady, of New Rochelle; Mr. A. L. Blair, of Troy; Mr. E. M. Wheeler, of Dover, Delaware; Miss Eliza A. Youmans, of New York City; Messrs. A. C. White, Frank S. Williams, F. W. Palmer, and R. W. Hughes, of the graduating class of Hamilton College; Rev. C. F. Dowd, Rev. Dr. Stryker and Miss Stryker, with others from Saratoga and other places.

The company joined in the Lord's Prayer, led by Dr. Stryker. President Seelye was elected chairman, and W. C. Taylor, of Saratoga, secretary. A large number of letters endorsing the proposed Centennial were read by Professor Mears (as given below).

The chairman called upon Professor Mears to read his paper on the "Significance of the Centennial," in which the writer showed how the philosopher, who had scarcely wandered from the shadow of the paternal roof, and whose work—The *Kritik*—fell almost dead from the press, now, at the end of a hundred years, and four thousand miles from Königs-

berg, was honored by this group of thinkers and educators. He claimed, 1, that the study of *The Kritik* was a grand mental gymnastic; 2, would prove an effectual antidote to materialism; and 3, led to the correction of its own errors by inviting us to study the further supplementary works of the author.

He was followed by Professor George S. Morris, on "The Higher Problems of Philosophy." These are the true theory of knowledge and the true theory of being. The immediate problem of philosophy is to correct the narrowness of sensational psychology and the narrow conception of "being" expressed by the word "substance."

President Bascom read a paper on Kant's distinction between speculative and practical reason. He took the ground that Kant did more for true philosophy by his dogmatism than by his logical reasonings.

The paper of Professor Josiah Royce, of the University of California, was read in part by Mr. F. S. Williams, and in part by Mr. A. C. White, both of the graduating class of Hamilton College. Professor Royce argued that philosophical progress could be best secured by a reform of *The Kritik*, in its definition of experience. He proposed three "forms" of thought in the place of Kant's "Categories," viz.: memory, anticipation, and a recognition of the existence of an external universe, with every separate sensation. This paper was discussed by Professors Mears and Morris and by President Bascom.

The paper of Lester F. Ward, of the United States Geological Survey, on "The Antinomies of Kant in Relation to Modern Science," was read by Mr. R. W. Hughes. Mr. Ward endeavored to show that modern science had given the preponderance to the negative and rationalistic side of the famous antinomies of *The Kritik*.

Dr. W. T. Harris's paper on "The Relations of Kant's *Kritik* to Ancient and Modern Thought," having arrived by express on the 7th inst., was read by Dr. Mears on the evening of that day in the Temple Grove parlor. The ancients doubted of objective reality; the moderns doubt the reality of their subjective affirmations. True philosophy must solve both these forms of doubt. The course of philosophical speculation is under the guidance of Providence. A novel turn was given to the discussion by attributing to Kant's subjectivity an ironical significance, which was combated by Professors Bennett and Mears. References to Trendelenburg in the essay called forth reminiscences of this great thinker by Dr. Bennett, who had studied philosophy under his lectures in Germany.

A vote of thanks was given to Dr. Mears for his success in bringing about the Centennial, and to Mr. Dowd, of Temple Grove, for the use of his parlor, and for his invitation to use it for similar purposes at any fu-

ture time. Dr. Mears, President Seelye, and Professor Morris were made a committee to consider the expediency of arranging for future meetings in the interest of philosophy, after which the meeting adjourned.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

*From Professor R. E. Thompson, of the University of Pennsylvania.*

We should be most happy to have your paper for *The Penn Monthly*. I am glad to hear that you are working so hard at Kant. I have not had much time for him of late years, but I shall never cease to value what I learned from him, and I can imagine no better service for a college student than to make him familiar with the man who cleared the way for the new philosophy.

I have read part of Kuno Fischer's great work on Kant in the translation, and I think it most admirable. I have only his *Vorlesungen* on Kant's Life and Doctrine (a small book), and his *Anti-Trendelenburg*, which turns on his interpretation of the *Critique*. Mahaffy I have only seen, and that in the old edition. I have (1) Mirbt's *Kant und seine Nachfolger*, an incomplete work on the history of the controversies; (2) Herder's *Metakritik*; (3) Renk's *Muncherley zur . . . Metakritik*, showing that Herder cribbed from Hamann; (4) F. Baader's *Ueber Kant's Deduction des practischen Vernunft und die absolute Blindheit der letzten* (1809), which seems to me to hit the weakest point in the system; (5) Hartenstein's first edition of Kant's *Werke*, excepting vols. 2 and 3, and Born's Latin translation excepting vol. 3, and Semple's translation of the *Metaphysic of Ethics*; (6) Paul's *Kant's Lehre v. radik. Boese*; (7) Jachmann's *Prüfung der Kantische Religionsphilosophie* (1800); (8) Erdmann's *Entwicklung der deutschen Speculation* (I, 25-414); (9) C. L. Michelet's *Geschichte der letzten systeme der Philosophie* (I, 37-178); (10) E. Reinhold's *Geschichte der Philosophie* (II, 3-67); (11) H. C. W. Sigwart's *Geschichte der Philosophie* (III, 21-165); (12) C. Fortlage's *Gesch. d. Philosophie seit Kant* (10-84). These books and all I have are *Thomsonii et Amicorum*.

I know nothing of Meiklejohn, and little of Mahaffy. The latter seems always to do good work and yet to come short of the best. Kant is not strong among the English at present. Hegel has more disciples, but the greater part are taken up with Evolution, *pro* or *con*. The weakness of Kant's philosophy is exactly that which Herder felt with a poet's instinct but could not express adequately. It is also the weakness which alienates the modern naturalistic school from him. It is his unnatural dualism—"Nature spiritless, spirit natureless, and both lifeless." And

yet the truth he did see most clearly—the truth of human freedom, and responsibility based on freedom—is just the truth our age needs and Eze-kiel taught before Kant.

*From Mr. James M. Libbey, Editor of the "Princeton Review."*

I have just read your suggestion in *The Penn Monthly* in reference to the Kantian philosophy, etc. I am delighted that some one should have spoken out upon the subject of a demonstration next year, and I hope that such a convention of scholars as you propose may be effected.

I believe that much power now latent could be brought into play by such a meeting. I believe also that there is in America a genuine, wide-spread, and rapidly-growing interest in philosophical matters, but which, on account of peculiar political and commercial conditions, has not yet fully realized itself.

I believe that if you could get some eminent man of thought *and* action, such as Dr. Harris, interested in this matter, you would be doing a great service to the "American School of Philosophy" so called.

*From Professor Francis Bowen, of Harvard College.*

Your letter reminds me that just a century has elapsed since the publication of Kant's great work. And during that time what an influence it has had over opinions in philosophy and theology throughout the civilized world! Most of that influence, however, has been indirect, for up to 1850 how few persons *out of Germany* really knew anything about the "Critique of Pure Reason"! And even now I doubt whether there are more than a dozen scholars in the United States who really know and understand Kant in the original. Hence I fear that the public are not numerous enough to make a celebration successful.

I wish you all success in your undertaking, but I cannot promise any active coöperation with it. *Solve senescentem equum.* With my advanced years and declining strength, I shrink nervously from any new engagements, and confine myself entirely to my necessary college work.

*From Rev. Dr. Hickok, of Amherst, Mass.*

Yours of the 7th instant was duly received, and I thank you for the communication. I have not read your article relative to a Kantian Centennial, but think there must be a growing number who may favor such a movement.

I have nearly recovered from a successful operation for cataract, and find on hand some unfinished undertakings which press too strenuously to permit that I should let in any outside work.

I shall watch with interest any movement in the proposed direction, and commend most cordially your good attempt to your best judgment and effort.

*From Dr. Noah Porter, President of Yale College.*

Your circular is before me proposing a conference in honor of Kant, to be held at some time during the present year.

I am very much interested in the return to Kant in modern thinking. I have made a considerable collection of the essays which are occupied with him in the last few years. I am free to say that Kant has treated more questions than any philosopher of the last century, although I am far from thinking that he has answered all these questions satisfactorily. Indeed, the critical philosophy is open itself to the second criticism on many fundamental points and many points of detail. No writer repays study so well, and no writer needs to be studied more than he in order to be understood. I should be glad to aid in any practicable scheme in the way of accomplishing what you propose, but cannot with my present engagements promise anything very definite for myself, nor propose anything very definite for others. I see a plenty of topics in your list which I would like to have discussed.

*From Lester F. Ward, of the U. S. Coast Survey.*

I intended sooner to have expressed my approval of your proposed Centennial of Kant's *Kritik*, made in the *Penn Monthly* for December, 1880, which I read with pleasure and interest. In case a convention is held, I would be glad to receive notice of it at least, even though I should not be able to attend. If I contributed anything, it would probably fall under your second rubric, and treat of the Antinomies in the light of modern science. I am acquainted only with The *Kritik* and the "*Theorie des Himmels*," which I have read in the original and annotated somewhat. Everywhere I felt that I was communing with a master mind, whatever might have been its *objective* deficiencies.

*From Rev. Nelson Millard, of Syracuse.*

Your able and admirable circular in regard to the "Kant Centennial" is at hand. I heartily hope the Centennial will be held, and shall esteem it a privilege should my duties be such as to admit of my being present and enjoying its discussions.

*From Dr. Albert B. Watkins, of Adams, N. Y.*

Your circular regarding the "Kant Centennial" is at hand.

While I can get time neither to write nor to attend, I feel like writing

to say that I think you are doing a good and right thing, and one which, I hope, will do much to promote interest in metaphysical study in this country.

*From Dr. J. H. Seelye, President of Amherst College.*

President Seelye desires me to acknowledge his receipt of your circular respecting the Centennial of Kant's *Kritik*, and to say that, while his other engagements are at present so engrossing that it will be impossible for him to prepare any paper for such an observance, he is heartily in sympathy with the proposed measure, and would be glad, if it were in his power, to contribute towards its success. (*Private Secretary.*)

*From Dr. E. G. Robinson, President of Brown University, R. I.*

Your circular relating to a proposed celebration of the Centennial of the publication of Kant's "*Critique of Pure Reason*" has been received.

The revival of attention to Kant in Germany, England, and this country is certainly one of the significant signs of our time. And it is hardly possible to overstate the necessity of a right understanding of Kant on the part of any one who would criticise modern thought intelligently.

It seems to me you have well stated the aspects under which the *Critique*, and, in fact, the whole philosophy of Kant, might be viewed in different papers. There are several of them to which the attention of every well-read man must have been drawn.

*From Dr. E. Dodge, President of Madison University, Hamilton, N. Y.*

Your circular reached me some days ago, and would have been answered at once but for a severe indisposition.

I am in full sympathy with you in regard to all you suggest with regard to Kant's philosophy, except I would not like to speak as you have done of the "proton pseudos." I should want to be present at any gathering in Kant's honor. But do not attempt too much. Do not have too many papers and too little discussion of them. I would have *absolute liberty of thought*.

*From Mr. John P. Coyle, Princeton, N. J.*

DEAR SIR: A circular in reference to a Kant Centennial has fallen into my hands. My name is of no account to it, but a sense of obligation to the author of *The Kritik*, as well as a deep interest in the future of American thought, constrains me to record my vote, however insignificant, in its favor. I belong to that class of young men, not small I believe, yet too small,

who have been rescued by the study of Kant from intellectual chaos, from utter distraction. I know I am expressing the opinion of a respectable proportion of the younger Princeton men when I say that the one movement that will most benefit philosophy, and thus theology and all higher thought in America, is a revival of the zealous study of Kant, not as an authority—I hope we are beyond that—but as a propædæutic. He is the Euclid of modern thought.

*From Dr. George F. Magoun, President of Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.*

I received some days since the Kant circular, but sickness prevented my replying. The matter of a celebration of the Centennial of The Kritik has awakened very great interest in my mind, and I heartily hope it will succeed. It would give me very great pleasure to be present and read one of the proposed papers. I presume the time will be the summer vacation of the colleges. My recent ill health makes it possible that I may be abroad then, but nothing definite can now be anticipated about this; and so I write to assure you that all the reasons for the Centennial which you have named strike me with great force, and I entirely approve of the movement. I am specially gratified at the broad plan of discussion which you propose. It ought to promote not only interest in “divine philosophy” and in Kant, but also most vital and necessary truth.

*From Dr. J. Clark Murray, President of Gill University, Montreal.*

Your circular has been handed to me by Principal Dawson. I am glad to know that some movement is being made to celebrate the Centennial of the K. d. r. V.

On Friday evening last I delivered a popular lecture on Kant in the city, with immediate reference to the Centennial, and at the close of our University session I intended to gather a few friends at my house for a quiet celebration of the occasion.

I shall be happy to hear from you about the place of your meeting, and other arrangements. As a Scotsman, a pupil of Hamilton, and an expositor of his philosophy, I should like especially to know who will take up the fourth of the subjects in your list.

*From Professor Benjamin N. Martin, New York University.*

In reply to your enquiry about my own interest in the Centenary, I have only to say that I should feel a certain interest in it, but not perhaps of the deepest kind. As the initiator of a great movement he will always have a claim on the world's respect; but the incompleteness of



his work forms so great a drawback upon its usefulness that I can never refer to it with any enthusiasm. I am afraid that I cannot promise any important aid in the matter. At the same time I do not like to say this to one who is assuming the laboring oar in so honorable and public-spirited a work. Your list, too, of topics is so suggestive and fruitful that it seems as though I might certainly find opportunity for a brief paper on some one of those topics. You make us all your debtors by so earnest and generous a labor.

*From Dr. W. C. Cattell, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.*

Your circular, *anent* the proposed celebration of the Centennial of Kant's Kritik, is at hand. It strikes me favorably, but I leave for Europe this month, and shall not be back until the close of the year. I cannot, therefore, aid in the affair, as you suggest; but please use my name in whatever connection you see fit with those who are heartily in accord with the object you have in view.

*From Professor John Watson, LL. D., of Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.*

I think your idea of a Centennial celebration of The Kritik a good one, but, unfortunately, I fear I cannot personally take part in it. I suppose you are not aware that I have in the English press a work on "Kant and his English Critics; a Comparison of Critical and Empirical Philosophy," which I expect to be published (by Macmillan & Co., London and New York) towards the end of this month. Should the proposed celebration take place, I should be glad to submit a copy of that work to the convention.

*From Professor H. A. P. Torrey, of the University of Vermont.*

I feel great interest in your proposal to celebrate the Centennial of Kant's Kritik, and heartily approve of it.

I am the more interested because the philosophy which has been taught at Burlington since the days of President James Marsh has been so largely derived from the metaphysical writings of German philosophers, particularly from Kant. I should be very glad to attend such a celebration. There are undoubtedly a sufficient number of American scholars versed in The Kritik whose presence and contributions would make such a celebration memorable and of great service in the promotion of sound philosophy.

*From Dr. M. B. Anderson, President of the University of Rochester, N. Y.*

I have been absent, or very much pressed with work, since I received your note.

So far as I understand your views regarding the importance of the labors of Kant, I am in sympathy with them. It is true that both the strength and the weakness of Sir William Hamilton's thinking were due to his studies of Kant. I should be glad to emphasize in any way within my power the value of Kant's metaphysical labors. All adequate criticism of the modern materialistic schools must start out from the Kantian methods so far as the necessary laws of thought are concerned. The defects of his system you refer to, and they are obvious to every student.

*From Professor Borden P. Bowne, of Boston University, Mass.*

I was away from home when your letter arrived. I am inclined to think the proposed Centennial of Kant's *Kritik* more to be desired than to be expected. If a survey of the philosophical field, and especially of the problem of knowledge and its implications, could be had, it would be of great use. Such a survey, however, must be had from a standpoint which Kant has made possible rather than from Kant's own position. The advance of philosophy is possible only along the way which Kant opened, but a return to Kant in himself would be a regress rather than a progress. Hence I cannot regard the recent Kantian revival in Germany as likely to produce any good fruit. It is too uncritical and passive.

The desirability of such a meeting as you suggest is evident; but I can form no opinion as to its probability. The most of our teachers of philosophy have only a hearsay knowledge of Kant; and the students of Kant very often read their own views into him. If the discussion were confined to strictly Kantian views, rather than to more general problems suggested by Kant, there would be a risk of turning a philosophical discussion into one of exegesis and interpretation. This would be deplorable, but it is no uncommon result of Kantian studies. The advantage of the meeting would consist, I think, entirely in calling the attention of thinkers, alleged or otherwise, to the problem of knowledge and its manifest implications. It would thus serve as a protest against the shallow confidence of our present speculators, who think that philosophy is to be constructed from the side of physiology.

*From Professor George P. Fisher, of Yale Theological Seminary.*

I owe you an apology for my slowness in answering your printed letter respecting a proposed meeting in honor of Kant.

I should cordially approve of some such method as that which you suggest of paying honor to the illustrious philosopher, and, at the same time, of lending some stimulus to the prosecution of philosophical studies. I could not, however, count upon the privilege of personally taking part in it.

*From Dr. W. T. Harris, of Concord, Mass.*

. . . . I am very glad of your undertaking the Kant's Centennial. I had not seen your article in *The Penn Monthly* . . . . Although we shall do something to commemorate the anniversary in the Concord School (devote a week to discussions of topics relating to Kant), yet I think that the anniversary should be kept by American philosophers in an independent celebration, as suggested by Professor Morris. It ought to be held in such a manner that it will not imply an endorsement of any special institution. I shall notice your circular in "The Journal of Speculative Philosophy." . . . Our celebration of Kant is not in any sense a fulfillment of the plan you proposed, but only a contribution of a humble sort, undertaken by a few individuals interested in a special phase of philosophy.

I shall coöperate in your enterprise in any way you find me useful, and do whatever you ask of me. The January number of my Journal is very much delayed. My trip to Europe has cost me delay in all my work.

*From Dr. James McCosh, President of the College of New Jersey, Princeton.*

I had arranged months ago to go to San Francisco this summer, and I am just setting out. In these circumstances it is not in my power to show my reverence for Kant and his philosophy by attending the celebration on the 6th of July. You know that I hold the opinion that the American student should labor to take from Kant all that is natural and true, and reject all that is artificial and false.

*From Professor Jerome Allen, President of the New York State Teachers' Association.*

You and your associates will have all the privileges of the rest of us in all respects. [This refers to reduction in fares on the railroads to delegates coming and going, and to reduced rates at hotels.] I will attend to that personally.

*From Mr. Charles N. Dowd, of Temple Grove (Hotel), Saratoga, N. Y.*

We should be pleased to see you at Temple Grove during the convention of the New York State Teachers' Association. The parlor of Temple Grove will be placed at the disposal of the Kant Centennial, July 6th.